Black Death in Caucasian Mind - On Jacques Coulardeau's Criticisms of My Latest Book

Kaan Arslanoğlu

August 22, 2024

The name of my book: **"Turkish as the Founding Language of 'Indo-European' - The Concealed Root of European Languages"**

Coulardeau is a distinguished writer, an important thinker, critic, and linguist and a strong opponent of racism. I welcomed and thanked him for his early assessment of my newly published book. It is a comprehensive review. Of the 60-page text, 14 pages are directly related to my book, while the rest pertain to the topic at hand. Although one of his concluding sentences that could be considered a result states, "The point is that Kaan Arslanoğlu insists on the racist – and that's the only word that fits the situation – ideas of Aryanism and the concept of Indo-Europeanism, and yet he keeps alluding to, quoting, and getting inspired by Max Müller." I do not dwell on it much. This is what opposition to racism with a Western perspective looks like.

In this article, Coulardeau expresses information and opinions that support my thesis about a strong Turkish root at the base of European languages.

Coulardeau acknowledges that agglutinative languages are older than the so-called "Indo-European" languages. He accepts that those who speak agglutinative languages in Asia are Turkic. He knows that these two main groups live together or side by side. Then you must accept that the Turkic one is the main root, and get rid of this torture. Otherwise, I will continue to pile evidence on you.

Now, let me summarize the valuable author's views and critiques by numbering them:

1- He criticizes the term 'Western Languages' that I frequently use. He says that the term 'Western' does not only encompass European languages (such as English, German, French, Spanish), but also includes some local languages in the West (such as Haitian, Cuban, Venezuelan). However, these are not addressed in my book. According to him, it would be more accurate to use 'European languages' instead of 'Western languages.'

2- Regarding language families, he says the following: "However the author is not clear on the affiliation of languages to the four main families of languages: consonantal-root languages (Semitic), isolating languages (Sino-Tibetan and Tibeto-Burman languages), **agglutinative languages (… they are mainly Turkic languages, including at least four European languages, five with Basque)**, and synthetic-analytical languages that include Indo-European and Indo-Aryan languages …"

3- He then continues as follows: "Apart from including Latin, English, and German in the agglutinative family with absolutely no historical and phylogenic proof, the author refers to Turanic structures and a Turanic agglutinative subfamily, and this requires some discussion."

4- Here he finds me partially correct: "All these countries and parts of countries speak what we consider today Turkic languages, i.e., agglutinative languages. That was dictated in the 19th century by the ideological, or even political approach of this region to support what the author calls the Indo-European theory which stated that these Indo-European languages were the top languages in history, in sciences, in any field of knowledge in the civilized world, as opposed to the barbaric or uncivilized world, hence the basic languages of

civilization. **The author rejects this theory, and he is right.**" While saying "All these countries and parts of countries speak what we consider today Turkic languages … " he shows an old German map.

5- He puts forward a guiding view: "Aryanism (and listen to the rumor that soars from Nuremberg, Germany) is close behind this Indo-Europeanistic at least segregational theory that is nothing but mental gibberish. The question today is not to change the language that is declared the source and origin of all others, but to get down from our pedestal of European or Turkish intellectuals and ask the simple question: How did Homo Sapiens shift from a limited set of calls to the actual sustainable production of all our articulated languages?"

6- He claims that I made an error in dating the initial emergence of the Turkish language. I mentioned in the early parts of the book that Turkish is a language 7-9 thousand years old. I said this date is older than the history of Indo-European languages. However, this date does not cover the Hittite history of Anatolia or earlier migrations into Europe, nor does it include Göbeklitepe (according to Coulardeau). If Turkish is at most 9 thousand years old, then Indo-European languages would need to be considered older. This is not the case, Coulardeau says.

7- At the same point, he criticizes my statement that showed 1000 words in Western languages that fully overlap in sound and meaning with Turkish. According to him, 1000 words is an insufficient number to prove anything.

8- He points out that I did not ask the question, 'What were the ancient European peoples?'

9- According to the author, all these languages and populations came from Africa. Declaring any language family as the primary source without considering

this fact is, from this perspective, a mistaken and racist attitude. Indo-European theorists do this. The position of the Nostratics theory, which was proposed as an alternative, is similar. These theories were established with the aim of seeing the Caucasian race and the languages and cultures of European white people as superior to others. According to Coulardeau, opposing racism, colonialism, and such an imperial vision is justified. And that's it. If we accept that all humans come from Africa, almost the entire racism and linguistic problem is solved.

10- From this African root, when they left Africa, Sapiens first developed agglutinative languages, and 20,000 years later, by developing synthetic-analytic languages, reached a third formation.

11- The author says: "**Theo Vennemann** (born 1937) created vast debates with his theory that the **Old Europeans spoke agglutinative languages, based on his analysis of place names, river names, and particularly the case of Basque, the language of a vast Basque country (maybe ten times as big as what it is today) where the Old Europeans, at least in Western Europe regrouped when the Ice Age came close to its maximum, hence for 10,000 years from 24,000 to 14,000 BCE. Basque is an agglutinative language, very close to Turkish as my Linguistic Professor used to say in 1970-1973.** Theo Vennemann was the first to assert the Old Europeans probably spoke various dialects of some agglutinative language. This means that the people of this first wave of the third migration out of Black Africa used to speak agglutinative languages or dialects of one or several agglutinative languages. I am absolutely amazed Kaan Arslanoğlu does not refer in any way to this linguist who proposed, 40 or 50 years earlier, exactly the same hypothesis that Turkish is older than IndoEuropean languages. … **Once again, agglutinative Old Europeans**

represent 70-75% of European DNA, though IndoEuropean New Europeans only 25%, plus 3% from Neanderthals (who disappeared in Europe and the Middle East around 35,000 BCE, meaning these agglutinative populations must have been in the Middle East and Europe before this deadline."

12- Coulardeau continues: "Then the study of borrowings from Turkish in Indo-European and Indo-Aryan languages is banal. In such a situation we can even wonder why so little? The borrowings are only at the sound and meaning levels, not syntactic. Kaan Arslanoğlu gives very few phylogenetic elements at the level of syntax, except words that can be considered syntactic, like personal pronouns."

13- He points out that studying languages based on genetic research and haplogroups is problematic, and he quotes Klyosov, whom he criticizes, to show that even Klyosov has raised these concerns. He says that communities within a haplogroup might speak two or three distinct language groups. Studying languages in parallel with genes is "dangerous".

14- The author finds the Swadesh list and the comparison of languages based on this list problematic and outlines his criticisms on this topic. He questions how I selected these words, stating that what's important is not random word selection but showing their frequency of use.

15- He criticizes my view that 'Indo-European' languages represent a 'divergence' from agglutinative Turkish languages, noting that this is based on the mistaken assumption of a single common language in the past.

16- Another issue: "**I just wonder if concerning the roots that are common between the two linguistic communities (Turkish and Indo-European) the influence is ONLY from Turkish to Indo-European, or if is going BOTH WAYS,**

though yet it seems impossible to have it ONLY from Indo-European to Turkish. Our author is favorable to the first approach, I am favorable to the second approach, and I think the third one seems very improbable. … I believe there is another explanation than Turkic languages being the origin of Indo-European languages. The two sets of languages were in constant contact in Eurasia, and thus, they mutually integrated into one another, and their languages today reflect this long history of contacts and exchanges. And I am sure it can go both ways provided we know which one (word or item) came first, on the Turkish or the Indo-European sides. And that is a lot trickier than they sound alike and they mean something similar."

17- Later, the author provides numerous examples of words from my book. If I count the criticisms made against them collectively: There are no references, it's unclear which language they belong to, they do not conform to the sophisticated pronunciation rules he mentioned, some are not Turkish but Arabic, some are not Turkish but Persian, Persian is Indo-European, some have passed from Indo-European to Turkish, some entries are too short, some entries are too scattered... Additionally, Coulardeau has inserted Lacanian interpretations there.

18- The dictionary section is not organized in a way that provides an easy read for the reader.

19- For another section of the book, he says: "Let me now suggest a full phylogenetic approach, the way I see it. I was amazed by the six parts of what the author calls the 'Arbin Word Roots Saga' from page 255 to page 350." He also expresses negative views about this section.

20- The author says that linking these myths based on the phonetic similarity between Christ and Krishna is 'absurd' and even 'immoral.'

21- The author is very offended that I quoted Max Müller, and thus, he concludes that my work is racist: “The point is that Kann Arslanoğlu insists on the racist – and that’s the only word that fits the situation – ideas of Aryanism and the concept of Indo-Europeanism, and yet he keeps alluding to, quoting, and getting inspired by Max Müller. Even if the master – Max Müller in this case – realized, but too late, that his ideas were used by many to promote an absolutely racist vision of society, being sorry was just a useless confession. How many millions of people have been killed in the name of such Caucasian, segregational, white, blond, blue-eyed ideology, and we should add Christian of course? And that continues and still has numerous supporters.”

MY EXPLANATIONS

1- The concepts of “West” and “Western Languages” are universal concepts and everyone understands what is meant by these. We, as Turks of Türkiye, are in the middle. Whether we evaluate this megalomaniacally as "we are at the center of the world" or feel ourselves in "purgatory" in the negative sense, this is the case. When we say "East" we understand something specific, when we say "West" we understand something specific. In fact, "Westerners" as well understand the same things clearly. That's why there is no need to engage in political correctness based on concepts like a Westerner. A Western thinker cannot understand the East unless he has lived in the East for a long time. In fact, he cannot understand the world. This is the biggest problem of the world intelligentsia for centuries. Most of them don’t understand, but they pretend to understand a lot. They imposes those false and wrong views on the whole world. The biggest advantage of our (Türkiye’s) intelligentsia is that they know both Western culture and Eastern culture very well and have been raised that

way since childhood. But our people cannot use these advantages well. Because most of them are sycophants of the West, and some of them are fans of the East and Arabs. However, at least in terms of anti-racism, “East” have nothing to learn from the West, let the West learn from them. We are the most dangerous niggas for the "civilized" world.

2, 3 - Theories about language families are racist fallacies. The book explains this throughout its 780 pages from beginning to end. It repeatedly presents the documents and proofs. There is no Indo-European language community independent of Turkish (including Semitic languages). Many of the languages shown as part of the same family have Turkish roots. **Because in Asia-Europe, there was first Turan, Turkic, Proto-Turkic. This dominant language spread everywhere. It blended with local languages wherever it went. Then, it was repeatedly blended with new Turanic migrations in each region. This is how European languages were formed. Many languages, such as Old German, Old Scandinavian languages, Old English, Latin, were formed this way.** Each represents a different blend at various historical layers. None of them is completely in harmony with the others. There are linguistic gaps among them. But Turkish and Semitic languages are accepted that they are completely separate from others, while these others are related. Turkish is as compatible with these others as they are with each other. Because at the most fundamental level, it was always there. Let’s consider **Persian**, which is accepted as an Indo-European language. The author also considers it Indo-European. I thought that I explained in the book obviously, but apperantly I couldn’t explain it well enough. Let me summarize again: **Persian was born from the hybridization of the Turanic language with Semitic language**. Later, it was repeatedly blended with Turanic languages, Turkish, Arabic, and other local

languages. And there you have it: Indo-European Persian! Its Indo-European layer is Turkish.

Personally, I advocate for neither the West nor the East. I have no admiration for either. I share this information with everyone out of a human responsibility because scientific data has shown significant Turkic traces in Westerners, and the presence of Turkish in their languages is so substantial that it cannot be hidden.

5 and 9- Let me answer these two items together: Indo-European theory is a racist theory, yes, I agree with that. The Nostratic theory emerged with good intentions in opposition to the first one. I also accept that it is inadequate or wrongly based. But I do not accept that it is a racist theory. In fact, the Soviet regime did not support it, on the contrary, they prevented it. So, is the problem solved when we accept that Africa is the source of all languages and the source of civilization? Is racism ending? The hundreds of thousands of scholars who support today's Indo-European racist theory also accept “African origin”. Are they free from racism? If we look at it from the perspective of linguistics and phylogenetics, putting an end to the subject like this will dry up and kill science. Isn't this what we experience anyway? Accept the root from 60 thousand years ago, and suspend the root discussions of the remaining more important 60 thousand years. This attitude means open support for the Western racism that dominates world social science today.

That's why we say that academics and writers who look at the world with Western arrogance cannot solve any real problems. **Is racism only against black people?** Yes, there is still racism against black people in the Western world and elsewhere. **But this is no longer the new dominant form of racism.** Racism is carried out in the most severe way against anyone who is not

Western, Christian or Jewish, and the rest of the world. After 1945, massacres took place in Far Asia, and after 1990 in the Middle East, in which more than 30 million people were killed. Hundreds of thousands of black people, rulers and soldiers of great states, took part in these massacres. We are all Africans, yes, it is true, but what political or scientific problem did this solve?

On the other hand, Turks, as a community of tribes, are by far the people who have been subjected to genocide the most throughout history. They also committed a lot of massacres and slaughtered each other a lot. However, anyone who looks objectively can see for themselves that this is the population most exposed to massacres. But culturally, they did not have a tradition of complaining about this or telling it to the world with emotional stories. They live for the day. Besides they have no feelings of revenge. But the West never got rid of this feeling. According to them, the biggest massacrers in the world are Turks. The scariest monster in their spiritual world is always the Turks. When they do not fight, they show this by committing massacres in the ideological field. They erased the Turkish language from the atlas of languages and the Turk from history. They not only denied their Turkish ancestry, they hated it. A hatred far more fervent than their hatred of blacks. In Freudian words, "**patricide**".

6- The issue of dating the Turkish language: I did not say only that Turkish appeared 9,000 years ago. In the second item of the "introduction section" of the book, I wrote that since there is a definite connection between Native American languages and Turkish, Turkish must be at least 20,000 years old. In the first article of the book and in the section related to ethnic genetics, I included opinions that Proto-Turkic is about 60-62,000 years old. So where does 9,000 years come from? I have been researching these topics for over a

decade, progressing by reading and investigating. I learn new things with each passing phase. Many of the articles I wrote are polemical pieces with rival ideologies and ideologists. Currently, the majority of the global linguistics community shows Turkish as 1,500 years old. The first written documents of Turkish are dated to the 7th century AD! This is a betrayal of science. I responded to them based on a study. That publication mentioned 8-9 thousand years (Robbeets). That's it. The book needs to be read in its entirety and with more attention. This applies to every book. For Indo-European languages, they cannot show roots older than 4-5 thousand years (or even 2-3 thousand years). What they show is either fictional or Turkic.

7- When I wrote my initial articles, I showed around 1,000 common words. I had more, but I included only that many. And while this number may not be sufficient to prove that a language is root, but if the words are old, it is more than enough to prove that two languages have a common root. This is solid evidence to bust the myth of language families. But if we are in a genuine scientific community. Science used to be about proving the reasons behind hidden truths; for a long time now, it has become a task of hiding obvious truths with malicious interpretations.

8- The question of how ancient European peoples formed is asked in many pages throughout the book, and I provide answers to these questions.

10- This view is an important contribution, and I thank Coulardeau for it. And this view supports my thesis. But with one condition: **There was never such a thing as Indo-European. The peoples and languages shown as the ancient roots of Indo-European in Asia are Turkic and Turanic. Throughout history, there was not a single people independent of the Turanians that could be cited as an example of the old Indo-European community.**

11- I also thank Coulardeau for this point. It is an important contribution. **Theo Vennemann**, who wrote in the 1970s, **stated that an agglutinative language was spoken in Europe thousands of years ago, before Indo-European languages.** I did not know him. It is good to learn. I am not an artificial intelligence. I am not a linguist either. I cannot know everything. I try to make the most of the difficult opportunities that come my way. I try to learn something from every publication, every person. I have read many great works that are very difficult to access and understand. I try to combine, analyze, and synthesize what I have learned from them to offer opportunities to others. Those who read with curiosity and a love for science will benefit greatly from this. Returning to the topic: Vennemann was an important figure. But Coulardeau can find in the book a list of Westerners who wrote about this much earlier, starting from the 1100s. Icelandic saga writers like **Are Frode, Snorre Sturluson** … Swedish historian **Sven Lagerbring**, Dutch linguist **Marcus Zuerius van Boxhorn** (1627). And Frenchman **Leon Cahun** (1896) wrote about the dominance of Turanic languages in France in the past. There are others as well…

12- According to the author, showing the Turkish roots in Indo-European is a "banal" issue. Such a shallow expression cannot be defended in the name of linguistics. If we accept this view, let's abandon this area entirely. Let's leave the field to the great states, the big academy, and the Western writers at the service of big politics. He says that the number of examples provided is small! Is 15,000 Western words with Turkish roots few? Are commonality rates of up to 40% on the Swadesh list few? How much more should there be? I have more, but if they won't be read, why should I provide them? Dear writer Coulardeau is not one of them. But if the majority of academics want to remain ignorant, let them remain that way. Educating such people by pressure can only make

evil more knowledgeable. It is said that meaning and sound similarities are shown in word examples, but syntax similarities are not mentioned. They are mentioned; this is provided in many words. Moreover, there is a separate section on syntax similarities, which no Western linguist has reached in its essence and detail so far.

13- It is good if Western academia conducts genetic studies to prove their own theses. However, if those like us interpret the same studies differently, suddenly they become dangerous and racist. I'm not saying this for the author; he approaches these studies cautiously and find them dangerous for everyone. However, those like us, the opposing view, especially have to choose evidence from every dimension. The dominant power tells us, no matter what evidence we show, "that dimension is not important, this dimension is important." If we show what they said, this time something else becomes important. We must present counter-evidence in all dimensions so that black science remains mute. Genetics, archaeology, history, cultural documents, mytology, linguistic dimensions… All should be considered together. Also, I am not claiming that a population of a haplogroup spoke a single uniqe language at the same time or in different periods. As far as I read, Klyosov does not hold such a view either.

14- I am not a fan of the Swadesh list either. Despite the claims from dominant linguistics that I am fabricating the data, and despite presenting evidence to them, and facing the repeated recorded responses of "he cannot prove his theses" without even looking at the evidence, I must use all available evidence and methods. This is for honest and objective people. The suggestion to select words for the list from the most frequently used ones is entirely invalid. It complicates things unnecessarily. How can I know how frequently an Old Turkic or Sanskrit word from 1500 years ago was used at that time?

15- I have no claim to a single common language from the past because I do not know it. However, I know that Proto-Turkic is purportedly older than Indo-European and is its root. Of course, not its root alone.

16- In my opinion, it contains both correct and incorrect elements. However, there is no need to respond further. I explained them in the other points.

17, 18- If I had kept the dictionary section broader, it would have exceeded 1000 pages. This was technically impossible. On the other hand, how could someone who hasn't read all 780 pages read 1000 pages? A method that would make it easier for the reader to read could have been considered in terms of editing, but that was technically and financially infeasible. I also have this naive expectation or trust towards the reader: that people who read with curiosity and love for science will perceive and understand every fragment and every sign there, and be motivated to read more and engage in research. But many readers see themselves as members of a grand jury, taking pleasure in finding faults. Instead of finding faults or giving grade, why not try to learn something? Try to overcome the arrogance of thinking you know best and become a student. What you read might be things you can't find anywhere else… Just because you didn't understand it doesn’t mean it’s wrong. This is what I do when reading various difficult and even absurd texts. These are not comments made about Coulardeau. I am referring to the general situation. As for his criticisms… He says, "This is Arabic, this is Persian, this is Indo-European... it is not Turkish." I have checked each of these at least 25-30 times, and I am not exaggerating. These are words that have formed clusters within Turkish throughout history. Many of these have been proven by “real laws of sounds changes.” Many of these laws, found by Adnan Atabek, a Turkish writer, are

unknown to almost all world linguists. This topic is examined in a separate section of the book.

19- I am essentially a literary figure and novelist, beyond my previous work in psychiatry and political philosophy. In those sections, I aimed to add a literary, epic quality to the otherwise dry debate environment of linguistics. It seems I was unable to convey this feeling to the author.

20- There is a universal parallelism and commonality between diffirent myths and their heroes. If some writers have articulated these commonalities and added their own interpretations, what does that have to do with “immorality”? I was very surprised by the approach that brings mythology into the realm of moral debate.

21- I could not reconcile this view and its expression with the valuable Coulardeau’s high knowledge and intelligence. I extensively explained in the book that Max Müller and other Indo-European, Aryan inventors were racist. Can’t quotes be made from a rival or even an enemy ideological figure? On the contrary, quotes from them are ones that further strengthen your opposing thesis. I have encountered many semi-intellectuals who either do not know or pretend not to know this simple and ordinary process and use it to condemn you. But seeing the same reaction from someone of Coulardeau's level is extraordinarily surprising.

As a Result: Yes, I suppose a big question mark has arisen in your mind. Coulardeau knows and says that the Indo-European-Aryan theory was created by colonial racists. He argues that opposing them is justified. However, he defends the concept of language families invented by them just as they do. In this confusion, he declares my work as racist! Why, but why? Because I quoted Max Müller!.. Moreover, I did not write anything against the view that "the first

root is Africa" in the book. How did I become so easily labeled as racist? I am also ideologically opposed to Freud and Lacan. Yet I have quoted them many times. Did I become Freudian or Lacanian? This kind of straightforward logic is not understandable. I suppose the author, accustomed to Lacan's extreme and absurd abstractions, perceives and rejects simpler and more direct abstractions in their most concrete sense.

In closing: against all odds … **Sincere thanks and respects to Jacques Coulardeau …**

Amazon:

https://www.amazon.com/Turkish-Founding-Language-Indo-European-Concealed/dp/B0D9S7BXJW/